

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

<p>To:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">see form PCT/ISA/220</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 0 auto; width: 80%;"> <b>IBM</b>  FRANCE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT    <b>0 8 OCT. 2004</b>    <b>ACTION</b> </div>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">PCT</h2> <p style="text-align: center;">WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)</p>
<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)</p>		
<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220</p>		<p><b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below</p>
<p>International application No. <b>PCT/EP2004/050721</b></p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year) <b>06.05.2004</b></p>	<p>Priority date (day/month/year) <b>30.06.2003</b></p>
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC <b>G06F17/30</b></p>		
<p>Applicant <b>INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION</b></p>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the International application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the International application



2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for International preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  </div> <p>European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas  Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl  Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016</p>	<p>Authorized Officer</p> <p><b>Boyadzhiev, Y</b></p> <p>Telephone No. +31 70 340-4548</p> <div style="text-align: right;">  </div>
---	--

10/562020

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/050721

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

IAP20 R2004/050721 22 DEC 2005

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/050721

**Box No. II Priority**

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims 1-9

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims 1-9

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

10/562020

IAP20 REC'D PCT/EP 22 DEC 2005  
International application No.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

PCT/EP2004/050721

**Re Item V.**

- 1 The following documents are referred to in this communication:
- D1 : GB 2 366 037 A (IBM) 27 February 2002 (2002-02-27)
  - D2: REYNOLDS F ET AL: "Composite Capability/preference Profiles (CC/PP): A user side framework for content negotiation" W3 CONSORTIUM, 27 July 1999 (1999-07-27), XP002257669
  - D3: W3C: "HTML 4.01 Specification" W3 CONSORTIUM, [Online] 24 December 1999 (1999-12-24), pages 183-194, XP002297296 Retrieved from the Internet: URL:[http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/html40 .pdf](http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-html40/html40.pdf).gz> [retrieved on 2004-09-21]

**I. Objections under Article 6 PCT**

1. The application does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because claims 1 and 6 are not clear.
2. The expression "network display possibility(ies)" used in claim 1 makes the claim unclear because the term has no well-defined meaning in the art. According to the description (p.10 lines 20-22, "The ... network preferences...") device preferences are checked for compatibility with the network preferences, therefore for the rest of the examination procedure the term "network display possibilities" is interpreted as "network preferences".

The above objection also applies to the use of the same term in claim 6.

**II. Objections under Article 33(3) PCT**

1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-9 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

The problem to be solved by the present invention according to the description (p.4 lines 2-8, "It is ... itself", p.7 lines 9-11, "In the ... feature." and p.7 lines 17-24, "The ... installed.") may be regarded as how to optimize the presentation of a HTML V4 page which includes CSS on a web device having a browser not supporting CSS (HTML V3.2) while using the presentation features (the CSS) of the HTML V4 page to the maximum of the display capabilities of the web device.

Document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1 and discloses :

2. A method executing on a computing system for allowing a device using a Web browser unable to support CSS, to request through a network and display Web HTML page including CSS while using all the presentation features of the included CSS that it can support through the network, (p.1 lines 3-6, "The present ... target device.", p.3 lines 1-8, "Unfortunately ... claim 1." and p.2 lines 6-9, "Once ... W3C.") said method comprising the steps of :

- receiving a request from the device for obtaining a Web HTML page; (p.5 lines 26-27, "the request ... server 46.")
- identifying the requesting device, (p.6 lines 10-13, "The style sheet ... request.")
- retrieving the requested Web page from a Web server; (p.5 lines 33-34, "The parsing ... the requested document 56 ...")
- modifying the statements of the HTML page which are not related to CSS, reflecting the CSS rule list while taking into account the device and network possibilities as stated in the Request rule list; (p.8 lines 37-41, "After ... others." and p.10 lines 6-9, "Comparing ... deleted.")
- transmitting to the device the HTML page comprising the modified statements. (p.9 lines 41-43, "After ... display.")

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from this known from D1 in that:

a) aggregating all the device and network display possibility information, and suppressing the contradictory information, the network display possibilities being of the highest priority, the result forming a Request rule list;  
According to the description (p.11 lines 17-21, "We ... sample.") the aggregation feature gives priority to the value of a presentation attribute defined in the network preferences over the value of the same attribute defined in the device preferences, when creating the Request rule list (the list of presentation attributes).

b) aggregating all the CSS presentation definitions of the Web page while suppressing the conflicting ones in a resulting CSS rule list;  
According to the description (p.12 lines 19-25, "For ... list.") this feature determines which presentation definition to apply in case of embedded and external CSS rule.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/050721

The features "a)" and "b)" are not related to the problem to be solved as stated above, therefore cannot be considered as making an inventive contribution.

Furthermore features a) and b) are disclosed in D2 and D3.

for feature a) see D2 : (p.3 lines 11-12 and lines 29-30, "CC/PP .. agents.", and "Recognize ... etc.") and (p.8 lines 30-33 and lines 38-42, "When ... rule." and "It is ... document.")

for feature b) see D3 : (p.184, lines 34-36, "Cascading ... together.") and (p.185, lines 35-36, "HTML ... sheets.") and (p.192 lines 4-10, "If ... element.").

Therefore the solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

The same reasoning applies, "mutatis mutandis", to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claims 8 and 9 which are also considered not inventive.

3. Dependent claims 2-7 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).